

Islam and the Oregon Public-School Law

HON. PIERRE CRABITÈS

Judge of the Mixed Tribunals, Cairo, Egypt

Reprinted from the "American Bar Association Journal"

"IMITATION is the sincerest flattery. Why should we then in all essentials you are copying us?" This was the quick retort which I received from one of the Sheiks of Al Azhar when I asked him whether his collegiate mosque contemplated becoming part of the great Europeanized Royal Egyptian University. But after having dealt me this body blow he added: "You and I are friends of long standing. You know the East too well to have asked me this question unless you are ruminating about something. Sit down and let us have a heart to heart talk." And so we did. When I left him the evening star was twinkling. It seemed to wink furtively at me and then again to whisper in my ear, with tantalizing emphasis, those words of Oliver Goldsmith which proclaim that:

"Truth from his lips prevail'd with double sway,
And fools who came to scoff remain'd to pray."

It was, however, very unfair of Venus to play such pranks upon me. I love the East with a fondness that binds me to her with hoops of steel. I really had not "come to scoff" although I did remain "to pray."

MANY TALKS TOGETHER

Nor was this the first time that Sheik Mahmoud Ibrahim and I had discussed the problem of education. We had already gone over the subject on other occasions. Some three years ago we had, in fact, considered a concrete propo-

sition, that of the Oregon Compulsory Public School law. I was very much interested in the issue opened up by this enactment. It forbade parents from sending their children between the ages of 8 and 16 years to what are known as parochial or denominational schools. I wanted to get the reaction of Al Azhar to such a statute. I, therefore, took up the matter not with one but with several Sheiks, among whom was my interlocutor. He knew that I had submitted the Oregon law to Sheik Muhammad Bekhit, the former Grand Mufti of Egypt, and that the *fetwa* delivered to me by that distinguished Doctor of Laws had carefully gone into the subject. Sheik Mahmoud Ibrahim therefore lit right into me and carried the war not into Africa but into America. "Your ideas about education are radically wrong," said he. "You subordinate the family to the State. You forget that parents have paramount rights. I know that you told me that your High Court has nullified that foolish law we discussed three years ago. But I cannot take much stock in schools which turn out such stupid legislators."

I did my best to get my friend to see our viewpoint. He listened with great courtesy and replied: "You have told me that you are preparing a paper for one of your American magazines. Do not, therefore, waste your time in attempting to convert me to your ideas. Let your readers understand our way of looking at things. Put Sheik Muhammad Bekhit's *fetwa* before them. Let them read it in full. Tell them what is meant by a *fetwa*. Let them judge from the complete text of that document how Islam handles the problems which confront you."

THE "FETWA"

I feel that I must comply with the request thus made of me. It would be a work of supererogation to give a definition of the Arabic word *fetwa*. All who are interested in the East understand that the term applies to what I might describe as a reasoned professional opinion given by an *Alim* or Muhammadan jurisconsult upon a question of Islamic law. Shiek Muhammad Bekhit was not only for years Grand *Mufti* of Egypt, but he is universally revered for his high character and outstanding scholarship. A *fetwa* signed by him is, therefore, a pronouncement of tran-

scendent merit. Muslim practice requires that a *jetwa* consist of a specific question and of a categorical answer. I shall, therefore, submit the inquiry and the reply elicited by it. Here they are. The latter exhales the perfume of the East, crystallizes the civilization of the Orient and puts us into touch with principles which should make us stop and think.

QUESTION

"To His Eminence the learned Sheik Muhammad Bekhit, former Grand *Mufti* of Egypt.

"Pierre Crabitès has the honor to submit to your Eminence the following questions. It is asked that a reply be given to them:

"'Under Muhammadan law has a father or guardian the right to send his children or wards to any school chosen by him where the curriculum contains naught contrary to his religion, good morals or the public polity of the state?'

"'May the state or any public authority validly prevent the father or guardian from exercising this right?'"

"PIERRE CRABITÈS."

Cairo, June 9, 1923.
(Original signed.)

ANSWER

"In the name of Allah, the Clement and the Merciful. Allah alone be praised. Prayers and Salvation for Him since whose coming there have been no prophets.

"Having taken cognizance of the two preceding questions we declare that the principles of Muslim law vest the right of the education of a minor in his or her uterine relations, the whole as hereinafter provided. The reason for this is that minors are unable to look after their own interests. The lawmaker has, therefore, inquired into the matter. Islamic jurisprudence and the Doctors of Muhammadan law have accordingly very properly insisted that the education of the minor who has not reached the age of reason must be confided to the relatives best qualified for looking after his or her needs, that is to say to the women of his or her maternal stock.

THE MOTHER AND HER FEMALE RELATIVES

First in this category comes the mother herself, as was decided by the Prophet himself—may Allah bless him and proclaim him—when a woman came before him and said: ‘O Messenger of Allah, this is my son whom I have sheltered in my womb, rocked upon my knee and nourished at my breast. His father has divorced me and wishes to take my child from me.’ The Prophet—may Allah bless him and proclaim him—said unto her: ‘Your right primes that of your husband unless you contract a second marriage.’

“And next in order comes the grandmother, the mother of the mother, as is shown by the following case in point: Omar—may he be in the good graces of Allah—in divorcing his wife Djanila, daughter of Assem, departed with his son Assem. The child’s grandmother, the mother of Djanila, overtook Omar and seized the boy. The grandmother and father thereupon submitted their grievances to Abou Bakr Al Saddiq—may Allah be satisfied with him—and he said unto Omar: ‘Do not interfere between him and her for her saliva is better for him than any honey or nectar that you, oh! Omar, may give him.’ And the child was forthwith delivered to his grandmother. All of this took place in the presence of the Companions of the Prophet. And this right passes in like manner to the female relatives of the maternal stock of the mother according to the order of succession established by Muslim law.

IN DEFAULT—THE MALES

“In default of female relatives of the maternal branch the right of education passes to the consanguine relatives of the masculine sex. In the first rank come the ascendants, that is to say, the father, the grandfather (father of the father) the german brothers, the consanguine brothers, the german nephews, and the consanguine nephews, etc., etc.

“If there be several relatives who thus have the right of educating the child preference must be given first to the most capable, secondly to the most pious and thirdly to the eldest. All of the foregoing applies to the child who has not reached the age of reason. This is fixed for boys at the age of seven and for girls at nine. This additional period is decreed for girls in order to enable them to understand how to keep house.

AT THE AGE OF REASON

"Once the minor, boy or girl, attains the age of reason he or she must be confided to the father. If this parent refuse to accept this charge he may be constrained to assume it because the child has rights which its father must respect. If the minor be a boy who has attained the age of reason it is necessary that he acquire such knowledge as may be useful for him in respect of his religion and in order to prepare him for the battle of life. Should the child be a girl the father is called upon to give her this selfsame instruction and also to preserve her and care for her. It is clear that the father is best able to fulfil this duty. Should he have passed away the child's paternal grandfather is charged with this responsibility. The same principle, in a word, is applied as that set forth in respect of a child who has not attained the age of reason.

"All this is primarily taken from the word of Allah as expressed in his holy book which is the Qurân. It is there decreed that relatives in general, whether they be or be not consanguine, enjoy in virtue of the right of relationship a priority in respect of the administration of all the interests of the minor, whether they be pecuniary or otherwise. So has Allah written, ordained and judged.

RIGHTS OF THE STATE

"The state therefore has no power over a minor as long as there be a relative who fulfils the foregoing requirements.

"If there be no such relative the attributes in question become vested in the sovereign, for the head of the state enjoys a general right in regard to all who owe him allegiance. The right of relatives is, however, special and not general. It is special because it applies simply and solely to the exercise of parental authority over specific relatives. The revered verse shows that the special guardianship flowing from ties of relationship primes the general tutorship of the sovereign. It therefore follows that the father of a minor, or in his place the legal guardian chosen from among the relatives of the child, takes precedence over the sovereign in all matters affecting the education and upbringing of the child.

"The reason for the existence of parental authority over the child being that the minor is unable to look after its

own interests it follows that it is the duty of the father or guardian to give the ward an education which will be beneficial to the infant. The father or guardian therefore is prohibited from giving his pupil an education which might or could vitiate his morals, teach him anything contrary to his religion, or which is opposed to the public polity of the state.

"From the foregoing principles it follows that under Muhammadan law authority is vested in the father or guardian of a minor to send his child or ward to whatever school he may elect in order that the minor may there learn all sciences which are not contrary to the religion of the infant, to morality or to public order.

"Neither the state nor any other authority may under Muhammadan law validly prevent the father or legal guardian of the child be it boy or girl from exercising the rights herein before defined."

1 Al Radah 1341 (corresponding to June 15, 1923).

(Original signed and sealed) MUHAMMAD BEKHIT, former Grand Mufti of Egypt.

COMPARISON WITH OREGON CASE

As soon as I had finished my translation of this *fatwa* I reread the opinion handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Oregon school cases. And then an idea struck me. It was this. I shall submit this decision to Sheik Mahmoud Ibrahim and hear what he has to say of it. I was afraid to trust my Arabic to so severe a test so I had a competent translator accompany me. My Muhammadan friend listened with the utmost attention. He interrupted the reader once or twice and had him go over certain passages a second time. When the task had been finished the Sheik arose, took the interpreter by the hand, thanked him and walked with him towards the door. It was clear that the *Alim* wanted to be alone with me so that he could unburden himself. I therefore dismissed the third man. As soon as the latter had left, Sheik Mahmoud Ibrahim turned towards me and said: "I knew that your judges would never look at the question as we do. They talk of the destruction of a 'remunerative business,' and they have never once quoted their Vangile (meaning the Bible). They say something about guarantees against the depriva-

tion of property without due process of law or some such jargon which I do not understand. It is a matter of money with you. God's wishes you have not consulted." I tried my best to get the old gentleman to see that the Court had distinctly said that "the child is not the mere creature of the state: those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right coupled with the high duty to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations." His refrain however was: "Then why talk so much about money and the law ruining the business of the teacher?"

TWO DIVERGENT MENTALITIES

While, of course, I do not agree with such criticism yet I must say that I am able to follow the Sheik's angle of observation. I see in this Supreme Court decision and in this Muslim *fatwa* the concrete expression of two divergent mentalities, the clash of two worlds, the shock of two civilizations. I do not attempt to decide as between them. I admire the pellucid reasoning of Mr. Justice McReynolds. I pay homage to the logic of Sheik Muhammad Bekhit's argument. Both men are valiant champions of their peoples. Both of them have brought to their task an impartial mind, deep learning and an abiding sense of equity. They have both reached the same conclusion. They have traveled by different routes. "Truth" as Bacon said "is the daughter of Time." Truth stands out in both definitions of principle because certain primary conceptions of right and wrong are immutable. It is, however, in surveying the route followed by both schools that one is best able to gauge how radically different the path may be but how constant is the final goal. As my readers are fully conversant with the scenes traversed by the eminent Washington jurist I think it better to devote more especial attention to the Islamic train of thought.

The reasons for judgment adduced by the Muslim Doctor of Laws recall to my mind the philosophy of Aristotle. I hope that my love for the East has not entirely wiped out my classical training. I, therefore, trust that I am correct in asserting that it was the Peripatetic group which so stoutly defended the primacy of the family. At all events the principles enunciated by Sheik Muhammad Bekhit unequivocally proclaim a doctrine which is against the drift

of the present current of Western thought. I shall not attempt to point out how, in ancient Rome, law, religion and administration emanated from one center and were directed towards one end. That center was the imperial will and that end was universal dominion. Nor shall I seek to show, as David Jayne Hill does with such mastery, how the struggle began for a world-wide Empire, how this gave way to the establishment of territorial sovereignty, and was in turn followed by the age of absolutism and successively by that of revolution and constitutionalism only to be supplanted by the strife for commercial mastery. I shall, on the contrary, content myself with saying that if in 1783 the American colonies were recognized as free, sovereign and independent States the Civil War converted our constitution into an indestructible union of indestructible States. In a word in America the tendency is towards centralization. The States may no longer claim to be able to nullify a law of Congress, suffrage has ceased to be solely within the control of the several commonwealths and a man's thirst may not now be quenched except according to regulations edicted at Washington. The Orient, on the contrary, in accepting the family as the unit of society and in adhering to the mother and the father as the primary sources of authority in all that concerns the welfare of the child is holding out against centralization, legislative tutelage and bureaucratic pinpricking.

ISLAM AND WOMAN

But I read far more into this *jetwa* than the mere preservation of the sacred prerogatives of mother and father. I see in it abounding proof of the exalted position given by Islam to woman. I am writing this as a man who knows that Anglo-Saxon civilization was formed in a mould which takes its cue from the principle affirmed by Blackstone that "the very being or legal existence of the wife is suspended during marriage or at least is incorporated and consolidated in that of her husband." This means that except in so far as our legislator may have interfered, an American wife is both a blotting paper which absorbs her husband's words and a phonograph which recalls her master's voice. This has, I know, been changed but the starting point is there. The basic formula is as I have given it. If a woman is

proud of her Anglo-Saxon lineage she should be willing to accept all that goes with it. The Muslim wife, however, need not be ashamed of her forbears. There is therefore in respect of woman's status a radical difference between what I might style the intuitive, subconscious and hereditary viewpoint of the two civilizations, the one represented by the distinguished Associate Justice and the other typified by the erudite former Grand *Mufti*.

DIVISION OF AUTHORITY

For a moment or two I was somewhat nonplused by the division of authority between the maternal and paternal lines so punctiliously insisted upon by Islam. It seemed to me to be somewhat arbitrary. I had no difficulty in grasping why the mother was given precedence over the father in respect of the child of tender years. I followed the line of reasoning which led the Prophet of Islam to entrust to the father the minor who had attained the age of reason. I saw clearly why the grandmother of a very young boy or girl was deemed to have a right superior to that of the father of such an offspring. I divined the motive why in other cases the grandfather had the first call. What flabbergasted me nevertheless was the rigidity, the inflexibility and the constancy of the rule which made the mother's right carry with it as a corollary that of the women of the maternal line and the prerogative of the father beget a like attribute in favor of the men of the paternal branch. Seeing things through Occidental spectacles it appeared to me that in all cases where the rights of the mother were deemed paramount there should be no inherent reason for excluding the paternal grandmother or in the contrary instance for brushing aside the maternal grandfather. In a word my Western point of view made it difficult for me to follow the line of cleavage so scrupulously traced.

But I had lived too long in the East to stick to the glasses I brought with me from home. I discarded them and sought to study what was written in the light of the Rising Sun. I had an abiding faith in the common sense of the Prophet. I was aware of the fact that the Gospel according to Saint John teaches that the Saviour turned water into wine and that notwithstanding "this beginning of miracles," the United States, in the twentieth century, fol-

lowed Islam into the Prohibition camp where the Muhammadan world had been since A. D. 623. I knew that we now have woman suffrage and that we were thus imitating the Muslim emancipation of woman. I had read the Supreme Court's decision in the Oregon school cases and had learned from them that even if we favor centralization, standardization and polarization there are still judges not in Berlin, but in Washington, who defend the supremacy of the family. I was, therefore, certain that what appeared to be arbitrary and capricious was really a logical deduction from carefully thought out premises.

"PERSONAL LAW"—"TERRITORIAL LAW"

My study of the difference between "personal law" and "territorial law" soon put me on the right track. My investigations made in that connection taught me that Islam tends to divide the inhabitants of a given geographical unit into water tight compartments each with its own judicial essence, laws and officials. It, therefore, was relatively easy for me to perceive that this same principle of insulation was applied to the rights of the mother and of the father in reference to their offspring. Once this notion percolated into my cranium the rest was easy sailing. And here is how I recapitulate this phase of Muslim civilization.

There is no fusion between husband and wife. Each has and preserves his or her own property. The same dominant postulate is applicable to father and mother. The mother is given the cream and the father the skimmed milk. I mean by this that the mother is accorded the control of the child when its mind is particularly plastic, malleable and impressionable. Saint Ignatius Loyola is reported to have said: "Give me the child until it is seven and you may have it forever afterwards." I have seen no such statement in any recognized biography of the great Jesuit but the quotation has about it the ring of probability. Be that as it may, the Oriental marries at so young an age that when Muhammad gave the mother control over the boy until he was seven and over the girl until she was nine the Prophet turned over loaded dice to the father. He meant to make the imprint of the mother upon the mind and soul of the child both deep and durable. To clinch this hegemony of

the mother he did not propose that any of her in-laws, male or female, should have any chance to remove the spirit of her influence should death call her away. Having reached the decision that the mother's personality should dominate what he considered the crucial and formative period of the child he carried, I repeat, his "Safety First" policy to the point of insuring this spiritual ascendancy of the mother even in the event of her demise. But the founder of Islam did not deprive the father of his "last clear chance." Muhammad may have given the child's procreator skimmed milk but fair play required that man be allowed to drink it without interference.

EAST AND WEST AGAIN

I do not say that I approve of any such hard and fast rule. My individual preference has nothing to do with my bald recital of facts. I may be permitted, however, to point out that the tenets which I have just set forth were defined over 1,300 years ago. We, of the West, have not as yet so systematized things. Our institutions do not say how far the paternal authority goes or where the maternal control enters. We have no hard and fast rule as to the allotment of children in the case of divorce. We introduce into such matters the element of personal equation. I do not mean to imply aught in derogation of the impartiality of our judges. I do not say that indigestion, insomnia or inadvertence may decide the fate of a child. I simply insist upon the radical difference underlying the social structure of Islam and that of Christendom.

The East works along lines of special franchises, staked-out preserves and reserved compartments. I shall not attempt to elaborate this point. I think that I have already said enough to make my meaning clear. I do feel justified, however, in insisting that this "personal law," this distinction between maternal suzerainty and paternal dominion, this segregation of a wife's purse from her husband's wallet, all of this accounts for the status of woman in Islam. It explains the meaning of her veil. As I see things this flimsy filament is a symbol. As I read the psychology of the Orient the lines of demarcation between man and woman, between the world and the harem, between the seen and the unseen, is the inevitable complement of an economic

structure which is foreign to the genius of the Occident. We cannot fathom why the woman of Islam should be secluded because the predicate upon which Sheik Muhammad Bekhit bases his argument is unknown to our philosophy. Promiscuity underlies our social fabric. Consolidation not in the sense of the modern trust but interpreted as implying cooperation, mutuality and solidarity forms the cornerstone of our institutions. We, therefore, have grave difficulty in grasping that if woman is kept away from man he is excluded from her. He is as much isolated from her world as she is exiled from his. She is no more a recluse than he is an anchorite. It is not a bar sinister which hides her from your view and from my sight. It is simply and solely the impenetrable interlocking apparatus known as Islam which does not admit that a father may impinge upon the prerogatives of a mother, a husband upon the privileges of a wife or the state upon the rights of a guardian and which carries this axiom so far that men and women find themselves, like oil and water, unable to mix. If, in the sanctity of the home, family life obtains, it is because self-perpetuation is the second law of nature and because men and women must consort somewhere otherwise the race would be no more.

EDUCATION NOT AN END

In the light of these general observations it may be assumed that Al Azhar typifies a psychology which is in many ways radically opposed to ours. To introduce a Western curriculum into such an institution and to seek to have it harmonize in any essential with Occidental ideals would be a most drastic measure. "Do not forget," said Sheik Mahmoud Ibrahim to me, "that education is a means and not an end. You are copying from us more than we are borrowing from you. Why should we commit suicide today when you Americans have just admitted by your Prohibition law that the Prophet Muhammad was right when he made Islam dry 1,344 years ago? It took you a long time to find out a truth which we have always known." And then he grew pensive. I knew from the look in his eye that he had something more to say so I was not surprised when he added: "You are a judge of the Mixed Tribunals. You apply French law. Do you know why Nappleyun (Napoleon) came to Egypt?" I

said that I did not. "It was," he replied, "because he wanted to compile his codes. He therefore came here to study the Qurân. Your laws have many good points because he took them from the Qurân. They have many bad features because he did not stick to the Qurân. You, therefore, both as an American and as a judge of the Mixed Tribunals, should be the last person in the world to expect Al Azhar to borrow anything from a civilization which is continually coming to us for light." I do not say I agree with so sweeping a statement. It gives one, however, a mental picture of another world and emphasizes that clash of civilizations which is a subject of such absorbing interest.

THE EAST ENJOYS THE WEST

I was hard at work putting the finishing touches to this article when my front-door bell rang. A few seconds later I was vexed to hear my *suffragy* knock at my door. He announced that Sheik Mahmoud Ibrahim wanted to know whether I could receive him. My irritation gave way to a smile of pleasure because I am very fond of my Al Azhar guide, philosopher and friend. Besides I knew that this unexpected visit must have had some impelling motive back of it. The big bundle of newspapers under the arm of my visitor soon told me I was not mistaken. "I have brought all of these for you," said he, placing upon my desk a batch of marked Arabic dailies and a magazine. There were several issues of the *Mokattam*, of the *Ahram* and of the *Siyassa* and a copy of the *Flourishing Review*. "Read these," added the Sheik, "they'll tell you why we do not want Al Azhar to adopt your new-fangled notions." It would have taken me a month of Sundays to have waded through these columns but their headlines told the tale and the photograph of Breeann (Bryan) in the magazine confirmed the message. All of this printer's ink dealt with Dayton, Tennessee, and with the monkey law. It left upon the Muslim mind the picture of a bitter religious war centering around education with William Jennings Bryan standing out as the champion of revelation. It told of a battle between contending forces and the death of the Commoner gave the story a dramatic flavor. This write-up convinced the Orient that wicked men were fighting orthodoxy and that a martyr had died in the trenches.

YELLOW-JOURNAL STYLES

We should not think that the religious leaders of Islam do not read the daily papers. We should not imagine that the publishers of the Orient do not understand the art of coloring news. We should on the contrary reconcile ourselves to the fact that practically as much ill-digested knowledge is doled out to the Oriental about the West as we manage to absorb in regard to the East. When, therefore, a concrete case arises in Europe or America which furnishes a background for pro-Islamic propaganda it finds its way into the newspapers with a wealth of distortion which would make a yellow journalist of New York green with envy. It accordingly follows that the dominant men of the East think that they know a great deal about the "anti-Congregation" laws of France, the removal of the crucifix from the Italian schools by the orders of the old Italian political parties, and the reintroduction by Mussolini of Him Crucified. They have heard of the Oregon legislation and of the Tennessee statute. They are aware of the fact that Christendom is divided into sects and factions and that when the Turks besieged Constantinople the Greeks cried out: "Better the turban of Muhammad than the hat of a cardinal." As one of my colleagues so aptly expressed it, "If you really believe that Islam is sick, why can't you doctors agree upon a prescription?" Here is the kernel of the difficulty: if Al Azhar were to desire to steer towards the West, it is convinced that it can find no reliable compass. Frankly, I am satisfied that our dissensions are so manifold that Al Azhar has ever before its mind the words of Phaedrus, the Roman fabulist, who said that "it is better to submit to the present evil, lest a greater one befall you."

Danger of Protestantism

*Letter from Rev. Father Baeteman, Lazarist, Missionary to Abyssinia,
reprinted from the Dublin "Annals of the Propagation
of the Faith"*

THERE was a time, and that not so very long ago, when Catholic preachers and writers amused themselves at the expense of the Protestant Missionary. Certain aspects of his life and his propaganda seemed to lend themselves to this; but in face of the strenuous efforts Protestantism has made; in face of its conquests that we can no longer deny; in face of the danger with which this rivalry threatens the Catholic apostolate, it is not well to shut our eyes to the truth. A danger so real that a rapid glance at facts, supported by very telling figures should suffice to show Catholics their duty.

ARRESTING FIGURES

In 1815 there were 175 Protestant Missionaries; in 1920 they numbered 20,500. At the present time, according to the *World Missionary Atlas*, published last March by the New York Institute for Social and Religious Research, the Protestant Missionary Staff of Europe and America numbers 29,188 members; the female members number 8,609 married women and 9,125 unmarried; the native members count 151,735, of whom 10,493 are ordained ministers; the female element is represented by 130,191 individuals.

In 1815 the sum spent on evangelization was \$8,500; a century later, nearly \$39,000,000, and, in 1923, 1 milliard, 495,801,200 francs.

In 1815, there was not a single Protestant school in existence. A century later, we find 46,580 primary schools, 1,500 secondary and upper schools, 295 industrial schools; 101 universities, attended by 2,400,000 pupils.

If we were to study their onward march, country by country, the reading would show their indomitable energy, supported by such vast wealth that we would be tempted to despair, did we not know that God was with us.

CHINA, INDIA, JAPAN AND COREA

In China, where there are 175 Protestant societies at work, they have 6,636 Missionaries as against 2,440 Catholics; they have 6,600 primary schools, the Catholics 8,659; they have over 100 high class teaching institutes (universities, normal schools and technical schools) with over 30,000 students.

The power of Protestantism is extending daily. It holds the upper hand in the higher schools, and the educational conquest of China, especially by the Americans, is one of the most remarkable events in the Far East of late years. In the year 1918 they had, in Peking, 72 establishments giving an education superior to that given in other colleges—and the Catholics in China have but two universities!

In India, they have 41,000 agents as against 16,650 Catholic laborers; 15,000 schools, while the Catholics have but 3,200; 127 journals and periodicals, the Catholics only 27. Finally, their income amounts to 750,000,000 francs.

In Japan, there are 1,274 Protestant missionaries opposed to 430 Catholics. The journal of the latter has 2,000 subscribers, that of the former nearly 70,000.

In Corea, where they took up the work only in 1886, they have 542 European pastors, 611 Corean ministers, 1,449 catechists and 300,000 followers, with 3,021 churches and 22 hospitals.

MOTIVES BACK OF THE ZEAL

These are the only figures I shall give, though I might extend the list to an alarming extent.

Whence arises this ardent proselytism on the part of sects that do not possess the Divine truth? It must be acknowledged that the apostolic spirit animates them; that they understand, better than so many Catholics, the call of Christ to the apostolate; that the greater number of their missionaries, if they have not the virtues "reserved" for Catholic missionaries, show, at least, a very noble devotedness to the cause.

But the primary motive, the most efficient factor in the production of these very tangible results will be found in the enormous sums placed at their disposal by their followers.

MONEY GIVEN

Whilst the Catholic population gave barely about 9 francs 12 per head, the Protestants give 30 francs. In 1907, America alone contributed 107,000,000, the Propagation of the Faith, 6,402,587 francs. The Methodists alone, in a recent subscription, received a milliard in a few months, while the Propagation of the Faith distributed only half that amount in a century.

It would be edifying to institute an inquiry throughout each Catholic mission and find out the respective positions of both religions.

In one city in East Africa the Catholic mission is barely struggling to effect a foundation; and not far from this mission one of the five sects that have settled there has built, in a few months, a hospital that cost 10 million francs.

At the Presbyterian mission in Calabar they got a present of a vessel of 150 tons, but, this boat not being large enough, their Scotch friends sent them 80,000 francs to buy another. Then came an annual income of 5,000 francs, a gift of 85,000 francs to build an institution.

In the Solomon Islands they have a fine steamer which, twice a year, brings their bishop from station to station. It is with a sort of disdain mingled with pity, that the natives glance at the poor little barques in which the Catholic missionary ventures out upon the stormy waves.

PROTESTANT EVANGELIZATION MOVEMENT

It is especially in America and in England that the Protestant evangelization movement, which is active even in Europe, even in France, has attained incredible proportions.

In 1886 the youth of America founded the movement known as "Voluntary Students." Since that time over 11,000 were enrolled and left for missionary work. Their motto is: "The Evangelization of the World in this Generation." Their dreams seem rather ambitious, but their zeal never flags. In 1920 the Society had an income of \$350,000,000, and it was believed this income would exceed the milliard by 1921.

EVANGELIZATION SOCIETIES

And if we pass thence to England, we find missionaries who, not content with distributing bibles and money, pray earnestly and give their lives to the work, even going so far as to court the signal grace of martyrdom. There are, in England alone, 7 principal societies whose aim is the evangelization of the world.

1. The Association for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Lands.
2. Association for the Distribution of the Bible.
3. Association for the Spread of Christian Instruction.
4. Ecclesiastical Association of Missionaries.
5. Society for the Evangelization of Indian Women.
6. Missionary Leaves Association.
7. The Junior Clergy Association, a federation of associations of young clergymen, whose work it is to support the missions.

Besides these principal associations, there is a multitude of others, secondary in importance, but no less active and popular. The generosity of the public is remarkable, so much so that from 1897 to 1898 the bishops received, besides donations for the above-named associations, the sum of 23,245,675 francs.

But money is not the only thing. What strikes us most of all in the Anglican missions are the treasures of mind and heart poured out, the energy and devotedness shown by those who devote their lives to the work.

WHY?

Such is the truth! A vast effort of men, money and labor!

I certainly acknowledge, as candidly as any can, that error can eclipse truth; that its followers have not the faith that urges, as with ours, to the test of blood; that many turn to them for a trifling reward and are but nominal converts; that the scandal of so many different sects that cannot agree upon religious matters must necessarily strike all who are capable of reflecting, and that in certain districts they labor only to prepare the ground for us. But all this does not do away with the fact that there is danger for us.

True, if we examine our own side, we have evidence of a decided onward movement, ideas that sink deep into the

public mind, generous efforts that are combating a painful apathy.

We have our Missionary associations, especially that of the Propagation of the Faith, which work and do battle strenuously. But the Protestant organizations that have to do with the missions are advancing at such a rapid pace that if they continue at the present rate, our future lookout is anything but reassuring. Our hearts are rent with the throbbings of pain difficult to soothe when we ask ourselves why our Catholic brethren have less practical zeal than our separated brethren.

We are ready for anything. Death itself, and beyond all, martyrdom, martyrdom, is our sweetest dream, but, in mercy, let our earnest appeals reach your shores and touch your hearts!

We will not fail, we will press onwards, combating, foot by foot, marching to the assault of these enormous masses of infidels, ranked, cold and emotionless, in front of us. We will advance as far as our strength will allow, till the day comes when death shall strike us down. Yes, they will ever go forth, they will ever fight, they will fall on the battlefield, on every road and byway throughout those distant lands, your exiled brethren, in sorrow, in suffering, brave, indefatigable seekers after immortal, erring souls, agonizing under the weight of the miseries of others, paying with their tears, their sweat and their blood the ransom of the world. And this advance, this unconquerable, invincible generation of the voluntary immolated ones, those soldiers of Jesus, these heralds of Christ will disappear, carrying with them to the tomb the inconsolable grief of not having been able to do all the good that *you* might so easily have enabled them to do, if following the example of our separated brethren, you had shown yourselves more Christianly generous.

Bigotry as a Virtue

REV. H. C. HENGELL, PH.D.

Reprinted from the "Catholic Herald"

RELIGIOUS bigotry is generally conceded to be a detestable thing, yet there is a type of religious bigotry which is a virtue.

If religious bigotry is taken to mean contempt of persons because of their honest and sincere religious beliefs, it is indeed a detestable thing. But if religious bigotry is understood as uncompromising loyalty to truth it is a virtue.

It is the fashion to boast of being broadminded in the sense of tolerating and approving all sorts of religious creeds and moral doctrines including, for example, Mormonism and divorce. Persons so afflicted are so broadminded that they have no depth. Charity to all persons afflicted with error in religion and morals is true broadmindedness. Charity for their false doctrines and immoral principles is a type of feeble-mindedness quite characteristic of the times in which we live.

CHRIST WAS DEFINITE

Christ instituted a definite religion and prescribed definite moral precepts such as the exclusive and life-long union of one man and one woman as the only moral marriage relationship. To tolerate and to approve doctrines contradictory to those taught by Christ is to deny His authority and to treat Him and His teachings with contempt.

Christ was always sweet and gentle towards repentant sinners. He described Himself as going after the lost sheep, but He warned severely against false prophets. He denounced their doctrines and insisted upon the acceptance of His doctrines under pain of everlasting damnation. Evidently He had no use for the sloppy mentality that chatters about one religion being as good as another. Tolerance of every sort of religion is in reality indifference to them all. Christ said: "He that is not with Me is against Me."

"DOGMATISM" A COMPLIMENT

The Catholic Church is often accused of being dogmatic and intolerant. Properly understood that accusation is a compliment. It recognizes that the Church knows her own mind and is not afraid to declare herself on moral and religious issues. The Church is always ready to instruct the ignorant and to pardon sinners, but she always insists that right is right and that wrong is wrong. That is bigotry if you choose to call it so, but it is bigotry as a virtue in contrast to bigotry that harbors anger against persons but confuses truth with falsehood and virtue with vice.